

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-9, as amended, remain herein. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found, for example, in the specification at p.15, line 17—p. 16, line 18.

This Amendment is believed to place this application fully in condition for allowance, and surely in better condition for any appeal. Thus, entry of this Amendment and allowance of all claims 1, 2 and 4-9 are respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting interviews around January 30, 2009 and on February 12, 2009, in which it was agreed that the foregoing amendments to the claims overcome the cited prior art. The enclosed amendments are not intended to change the scope of the claims, but simply to clarify the terms already in the claims.

1. Claims 1, 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The claims have been amended, mooted the rejections. In particular, the claims recite imaginary planes intersecting the electrode to form a cross-section of the electrode. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Kimura U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0101155. However, Kimura fails to disclose an electrode having a multidimensional meandering shape, as defined in applicants' claims 1, 4, 6, 8 and 9, such that no two parallel cross-sections have an identical shape. On the contrary, two parallel cross-sections of the electrode in Kimura may have an identical shape. Since Kimura fails to disclose every element of applicants' claims 1, 2, 4, 8 and 9, Kimura is an inadequate grounds

for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

3. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kimura and Manabe JP 53079. For the reasons stated above, Kimura fails to disclose every element of applicants' claim 1, from which claim 5 depends. Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify or combine Kimura and Manabe to disclose every element of applicants' claims. Manabe discloses a dome-shaped electrode. Manabe discloses an electrode with a rough surface. However, neither Kimura nor Manabe, alone or combined, discloses or provides any motivation to form a multidimensionally meandering electrode surface, as recited in applicants' claim 1, from which claim 5 depends. For the foregoing reasons, Kimura and Manabe are inadequate grounds for rejecting claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

4. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yamazaki U.S. Patent 6,433,487 and Kimura. However, neither Yamazaki nor Kimura discloses a first electrode having a multidimensionally meandering shape, as defined in applicants' claim 6. Yamazaki discloses an electrode surface having a saw-tooth shape. Kimura discloses an electrode surface having a dome shape. Thus, Yamazaki and Kimura fail to disclose every element of applicants' claim 6.

Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify or combine Yamazaki and Kimura to have every element of applicants' claims. Neither Yamazaki nor Kimura contains any teaching that would have motivated one of ordinary skill modify Yamazaki or Kimura to form a multidimensionally meandering electrode surface. For the foregoing reasons, Yamazaki and Kimura are inadequate grounds for rejecting claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

5. Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yamazaki, Kimura, and Okada JP 2001-1338757. As discussed above, Yamazaki and Kimura fail to disclose every element of applicants' claim 6, from which claim 7 depends. Okada fails to disclose what Yamazaki and Kimura lack. Okada discloses forming an EL layer by electrolytic deposition. However, Okada fails to disclose a first electrode having a multidimensionally meandering shape, as defined in applicants' claim 6 from which claim 7 depends.

Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify or combine Yamazaki, Kimura, and Okada to have every element of applicants' claims. None of Yamazaki, Kimura, or Okada contains any teaching that would have motivated one of ordinary skill modify the cited references to form a multidimensionally meandering electrode surface. For the foregoing reasons, Yamazaki, Kimura, and Okada are inadequate grounds for rejecting claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

Accordingly, claims 1, 2 and 4-9 are now fully in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge/credit any fee deficiencies or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-4293. If further amendments would place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP



Roger W. Parkhurst
Reg. No. 25,177
Adam C. Ellsworth
Reg. No. 55,152

Date: February 24, 2009

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-1795
Tel: (202) 429-3000
Fax: (202) 429-3902

Attorney Docket No.: 28951.3131